regarded Lord Beaverbrook as a somewhat irresponsible but gifted idealist, a dreamer of dreams, one who 'unfolded before our eyes a vision of enduring prosperity/ while Lord Beaverbrook publicly regarded Lord Rothermere as a statesman of solid worth and integrity, not easy to move, but once moved resolute in his course. Occasionally, they paid each other compliments in their newspapers. For instance, the *Daily Mail* announced that there was only one man worthy of succeeding Mr. Baldwin as leader of the Conservative Party, and that man was Beaverbrook; and, when a train on which Lord Rothermere was travelling ran into the buffers, the *Daily Express* reassured its readers as to the safety of this distinguished passenger, and in a leaderette drew attention to the irreparable loss the country had been spared.

Such exchanges of graceful compliments served to keep the peace between them; and they found a common cause, if not in the Empire, at least in a common detestation of Mr. Baldwin. All their newspapers, representing an aggregate circulation of at least six million, were turned on to attack him, with the result that his leadership of the Conservative Party was enthusiastically endorsed at two Party meetings, and each abusive reference[25] he made to Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaverbrook was warmly applauded.

After so signal a victory, there was little more the Press Lords could do. Lord Rothermere's retort to Mr. Baldwin's charge that he represented an 'insolent plutocracy*, was to point out that such an expression came ill from one whose 'father left him

[25] 'The papers conducted by Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaverbrook,' Mr. Baldwin said, *are not newspapers in the ordinary acceptance of the term. They are engines of propaganda for the constantly changing policies, desires, personal wishes, personal likes and dislikes of two men. What are their methods ? Their methods are direct falsehood, misrepresentation, half-truths, the alteration of the speaker's meaning by putting sentences apart from the context, suppression and editorial criticism of speeches which are not reported in the paper. What the proprietorship of these papers is aiming at is power, but power without responsibility—the prerogative of the harlot through the ages/